
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2016

by J C Clarke BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/16/3156224

14 Bostall Hill, Abbey Wood, London SE2 0RA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Buchan against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 15/4037/F, dated 14 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'The formation of a loft conversion including the erection of front/rear dormer windows and the rearrangement of the accommodation to provide a one one-bedroom self-contained flat and a one two-bedroom self-contained flat with separate entrances including a new front door entrance to Bostall Hill'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. My site visit for the appeal was arranged as an accompanied visit. Whilst one party (through no fault of their own) did not attend, as I could see all that I needed to from the public highway I undertook the visit unaccompanied by either party. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property includes an end-of-terrace, two-storey building, which is located on the corner of Bostall Hill and Bastion Road. Whilst the surrounding area contains a mix of building types it includes many other two-storey terraces. Although some of the buildings in the area have been altered using a variety of design treatments, most of the roofs of nearby buildings are pitched and retain their original form.
 5. A beauty salon operates on the ground floor of 14 Bostall Hill, with a display window and fascia facing towards the front and side, and a flat exists at first floor level. The building has a hipped roof, the side of which slopes towards Bastion Road. A large flat roofed two-storey outrigger projects to the rear of the building, the side wall of which is next to the footway alongside Bastion
-

Road. The hipped roof and side walls of number 14 collectively define the end of the terrace. Although its side elevation is partly screened by a tree in the adjacent footway alongside Bastion Road, the building is, by virtue of its street corner location, prominent in the street scene on both Bostall Hill and Bastion Road.

6. The proposed development would retain the salon and convert the flat into two new flats and include dormer window extensions to front and rear to accommodate the new living accommodation in the loft space. There would also be an alteration to the shop front to accommodate a pedestrian access to one of the flats.
7. The front dormer extension and alterations to the shop front would be of the same design and size as those which were included in the proposal subject to the earlier appeal decision (ref: APP/E5330/W/15/3006014). The Inspector found that these features would not have an unduly detrimental impact on the appearance of the terrace and there is no reason for me to differ from this conclusion.
8. The rear dormer extension which is now proposed would be smaller than the previously proposed rear extension that the Inspector found to be unacceptable in the appeal decision referred to above. However, being only just below the ridge line of the building it would be at a substantially higher level than the existing rear outrigger. Furthermore, it would have a 'box like', flat roofed design which would extend across nearly half of the width of the rear facing roof slope of the building and which would fail to integrate effectively with the pitched and hipped roof of the existing building.
9. The rear dormer would, being on the rear roof slope, be substantially hidden in views from Bostall Hill. Its roof design would also reflect the flat roof of the existing outrigger below and views from some angles would be interrupted by the trees in the footways alongside Bastion Road, at least when these are in leaf. However, the proposal would nevertheless form a prominent and incongruous feature in the otherwise mainly open views towards the rear of the building from along a substantial length of Bastion Road.
10. Whilst the Appellant states that the proposed rear dormer would be of the minimum size that is needed to create adequate living accommodation inside, this point would not mean that its visual impact would be acceptable.
11. I conclude that, due to its box-like design and visual prominence, and its failure to adequately reflect the prevailing character of the built form in the area, the proposed rear dormer extension would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Its approval would therefore conflict with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

Other Considerations

12. The proposed rear dormer extensions would enable adequate headroom to be provided to the staircase, landing and en-suite toilet all of which would serve the proposed bedroom within one of the proposed flats. It would therefore play an important role in enabling this flat to be created, and therefore in delivering the contribution that this would make to the supply of housing in the

area. Given the objective, set out in paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework, of significantly boosting the supply of housing, this point weighs materially in favour of the proposal. However, this benefit is not sufficient in itself, given that the proposal would add just one dwelling to the supply, to outweigh the harm and conflict with development plan policy that I have identified in relation to my main issue.

13. There is no evidence before me to indicate that the proposals subject to the current appeal would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of any neighbouring property or that the internal living conditions within the 2 proposed flats would not be acceptable. These points also do not, however, outweigh my earlier findings.

Conclusion

14. I have found that the proposed development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and that there are no other considerations which would outweigh this harm. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Jonathan Clarke

INSPECTOR